REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed on June 26, 2006, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration. Claims 1, 14, 19, 32, 37 and 38 are herein amended, and claims 43-44 have been added. Claims 40 and 42 have been cancelled. Claims 1-2, 4-20, and 22-39, 41 and 43-44 are now pending in this Application. Claims 1, 14, 19, 32, 37 and 38 are independent claims and the remaining claims are dependent claims. A version of the claims containing markings to show the changes made is included hereinabove. Applicants believe that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance. A notice to this affect is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2, 4-13, 19, 20, 22-31 and 37-40 and 42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,167,448 to Hemphill et al. (hereinafter Hemphill) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,594,786 to Connelly et al. (hereinafter Connelly) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,789,257 to MacPhail (hereinafter MacPhail). Hemphill discloses a management event notification system using event notification messages written using a markup language. Connelly discloses a fault tolerant high availability meter. MacPhail discloses a system and method for dynamically creating and cleaning up correlation circuits.

The Examiner stated that Hemphill is silent regarding an event message containing product versions currently supported and a definition of a set of classes for the product among other elements of claim 1. Accordingly, the Examiner cited Connelly as teaching product versions currently supported and a definition of a set of classes. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's statement. Regarding product versions currently supported the Examiner cited column 8, lines 53-64. A careful review of Connelly reveals that an event includes configuration data, and that the configuration data includes an OS revision. Thus, Connelly discloses a single version only, not product versions currently supported as disclosed in claim 1. The system of claim 1 can support multiple versions, and thus provide additional benefits as opposed to Connelly which is limited to a single version, and therefore provides less functionality than the present invention. Further, claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 40 and now recites the registration information includes a

definition of a set of classes and "wherein said definition of a set of classes includes, for each class, a name, a unique identifier, a description of the class, and definitions of dynamic variables for each class, said dynamic variables including properties and alarm attributes". In the rejection of claim 40, the Examiner stated MacPhail teaches wherein the definition of a set of classes includes, for each class, a name, a unique identifier, a description of the class, and definitions of dynamic variables for each class, said dynamic variables including properties and alarm attributes in Figure 13 and at column 18, lines 60-67, column 19, lines 1-12 and column 19, lines 17-19. A careful review of MacPhial fails to disclose or suggest the same. MacPhail discloses a triggering of a disk error event at column 19, line 17-19, however MacPhail fails to teach class name, unique identifier and description of the class. The Examiner stated that while these are not explicitly described by MacPhail, the template/class inherently includes these elements by providing member data/attributes/fields and template/class name. Applicants disagree with the Examiner's statement. MacPhail teaches, beginning at column 19, line 7, an event monitoring system that monitors devices and applications using various event monitor templates. Nowhere does MacPhail disclose or suggest a set of classes or that the set of classes includes, for each class, a name, a unique identifier, a description of the class, and definitions of dynamic variables for each class, the dynamic variables including properties and alarm attributes. If the Examiner is to maintain this rejection he is asked to specifically point out in the reference where this is taught. Applicants thus assert that MacPhail fails to disclose or suggest a set of classes or that the set of classes includes, for each class, a name, a unique identifier, a description of the class, and definitions of dynamic variables for each class, the dynamic variables including properties and alarm attributes. Accordingly, claim 1 is believed allowable over Hemphill, Connelly and MacPhail, taken alone or in combination. Claims 19, 37 and 38 have been amended in a similar manner and are believed allowable for the same reasons. Claims 2, 4-13, 20-31, 39 and 40 depend from claims 1 or 19 and are believed allowable as they depend from a base claim which is believed allowable.

Accordingly, the rejection of claims 1, 2, 4-13, 19, 20, 22-31 and 37-40 and 42 is believed to have been overcome.

Claims 14-16, 18, 32-34, 36 and 41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,779,004 to Zintel (hereinafter Zintel) in view of Connelly and further in view of MacPhail. Zintel discloses auto-configuring of peripheral on host/peripheral computing platform with peer networking-to-host/peripheral adapter for peer networking connectivity. Connelly and MacPhail have been discussed above. The Examiner cited Connelly as teaching product versions currently supported and a definition of a set of classes. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's statement. Regarding product versions currently supported the Examiner cited column 8, lines 53-64. A careful review of Connelly reveals that an event includes configuration data, and that the configuration data includes an OS revision. Thus, Connelly discloses a single version only, not product versions currently supported as disclosed in claim 14. The system of claim 14 can support multiple versions, and thus provide additional benefits as opposed to Connelly which is limited to a single version, and therefore provides less functionality than the present invention. Further, claim 14 recites the registration information includes a definition of a set of classes. The Examiner stated that Connelly teaches the same at column 19, lines 27-31. A careful review of Connelly at this location reveals a report which is summarized for all entity classes. Thus Connelly is preparing a report summarized for all entity classes. In contrast to Connelly, claim 14 recites that the event message includes a definition of a set of classes, not a report summarized for all entity classes. Connelly fails to disclose or suggest an event message containing event registration information which includes a definition of a set of classes. Claim 14 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 40 and now recites the registration information includes a definition of a set of classes and "wherein said definition of a set of classes includes, for each class, a name, a unique identifier, a description of the class, and definitions of dynamic variables for each class, said dynamic variables including properties and alarm attributes". As discussed above MacPhial (as well as Zintel and Connelly) fails to disclose or suggest the same.

Accordingly, for the reasons stated above, claim 14 is believed allowable over Hemphill and Connelly and MacPhail. Claim 32 includes similar language as claim 14 and is believed allowable for the same reasons as claim 14. Claims 15-16, 18, 33-34,

36 and 41 depend from claims 14 or 32 and are believed allowable as they depend from a base claim which his believed allowable. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 14-16, 18, 32-34, 36 and 41 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being obvious over Zintel in view of Connelly and MacPhail is believed to have been overcome.

Claims 43-44 have been added. Claims 43-44 depend from claims 1or 19 and are believed allowable as they depend from a base claim which is believed allowable. Additionally, claims 43-44 relate to maintaining a time history of a series of events related to an alarm attribute. Support for this can be found in the specification as filed at page 61, lines 12-16. None of the prior art of record disclose or suggest maintaining a time history of a series of events related to an alarm attribute. Applicants submit that no new matter has been added by the present amendment.

In view of the above, the Examiner's rejections are believed to have been overcome placing claims 1-2, 4-20 and 22-439, 41, and 43-44 in condition for allowance and reconsideration and allowance thereof is respectfully requested.

Applicants hereby petitions for any extension of time which is required to maintain the pendency of this case. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee, that is not covered by an enclosed check, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-3735.

If the enclosed papers or fees are considered incomplete, the Patent Office is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned collect at (508) 616-9660, in Westborough, Massachusetts.

Respectfully submitted,

David W. Rouille

David W. Rouille, Esq.
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No.: 40,150
Chapin Intellectual Property Law, LLC
Westborough Office Park
1700 West Park Drive
Westborough, Massachusetts 01581
Telephone: (508) 616-9660
Facsimile: (508) 616-9661

Attorney Docket No.: CIS01-06(4183)

Dated: September 22, 2006